

REMARKS

Applicants have amended their claims in order to further clarify the definition of various aspects of the present invention. Specifically, Applicants have incorporated the subject matter of claim 3 into claim 1; and, correspondingly, have cancelled claim 3 without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1 and 6 have been amended to recite that the hybrid material film has a hybrid material film side opposite a side of the hybrid material film adjacent the ITO electrode, thereby providing the basis for the hybrid material film side from which light is emitted.

Applicants are adding new claims 10-12 to the application. Claims 10 and 12 recite subject matter of claims 2 and 5, respectively, in independent form, with the additional recitation that the hybrid material film has a hybrid material film side opposite a side of the hybrid material film adjacent the ITO electrode. In light of new claims 10 and 12, claims 2 and 5 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claim 11 recites the subject matter of claim 4, but is dependent on claim 10.

The rejection of claims 1-9 under the second paragraph of 35 USC §112, as being indefinite, set forth in Item 2 on page 2 of the Office Action mailed September 3, 2004, is noted. Claims 1 and 6 have been amended to clarify the hybrid material film side; that is, claims 1 and 6 have been amended to recite that the hybrid material film has a hybrid material film side opposite a side of the hybrid material film adjacent the ITO electrode. Especially in view of amendments to claims 1 and 6, it is respectfully submitted that the hybrid material film side, from which light is emitted, is sufficiently definite so as to satisfy requirements of the second paragraph of 35 USC

§112.

The rejection of claims 1 and 4 under 35 USC §102(b), as being anticipated by the teachings of U.S. Patent No. 5,958,609 to Ueda, et al., set forth in Item 4 on page 2 of the Office Action mailed September 3, 2004, is noted. Please note that the subject matter of claim 3 has been incorporated into claim 1. Moreover, please also note that claims 2 and 5, which were not rejected on prior art grounds, have been set forth in independent form. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the prior art rejection set forth in Item 4 on page 2 of the Office Action mailed September 3, 2004, is moot.

The Examiner is thanked for the indication of allowable subject matter in Item 5 on page 3 of the Office Action mailed September 3, 2004. As can be seen in the foregoing, and in view of present claim amendments, it is respectfully submitted that all claims presently in the application should be allowed.

In view of all of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of all claims presently in the application are respectfully requested.

500.40666CX1

Please charge any shortage in the fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 01-2135 (500.40666CX1) and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP



William I. Solomon
Registration No. 28,565

1300 North Seventeenth Street
Suite 1800
Arlington, Va 22209
Telephone: 703/312-6600
Fax: 703/312-6666
WIS/sjg